REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed on February 27, 2004. Claims 1-3 and 32 are rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 13, 17, 19, 24 and 29 have been amended. No new mater has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11 and 13-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faisal, (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,652), in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,905) and Jamali (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,501). Claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faisal, et al., in view of Lee and Jamali as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morita, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,470). Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faisal, Lee and Jamali as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Ho, et al., (Decision Combination in Multiple Classifier Systems, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence). Claims 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,886) in view of Snow, et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,185,550). As discussed below, the pending claims are patentable over the above references.

Faisal discloses an information retrieval system that provides query feedback to a user to help the user to reformulate a query. In particular, the system in Faisal identifies query terms specified by the user, determines themes associated with the query terms, and displays a query response and hierarchical query feedback terms for the themes from the user query. Depending on the received query response, the user may decide to modify the query using terms from the hierarchical query feedback.

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, documents in Faisal are classified without any regard to a user's prior classification of documents. Specifically, the content processing system in Faisal analyzes a document based on its content, generates a document theme, and then classifies that document alongside those with related or similar themes. In the presently claimed invention, in contrast, the content of documents in a user's directory structure is analyzed to determine document classes that indicate the user's approach to placing documents in the user's directory structure. These document classes are then used to determine a document classification profile of a directory structure mirroring the user's directory structure. Subsequently, a new document is stored within the mirror directory structure based on the above document classification profile to resemble the user's approach to placing the documents in the user's directory structure.

Faisal does not teach or suggest the above features of the presently claimed invention. In particular, Faisal lacks at least the features contained in the following language of claim 1:

> ... analyzing content of the documents within the second directory structure to determine a plurality of document classes within the second directory structure, the plurality of document classes indicating a user approach to placing documents in the second directory structure;
>
> determining a document classification profile associated with the first directory structure based on the plurality of document classes;
>
> analyzing content of a previously unclassified electronic document to determine a textual profile and a graphical profile of the electronic document;
>
> generating a classification of the document based on the textual profile and the graphical profile; and
>
> storing the electronic document in one or more directories within the first directory structure based on the classification of the document and the document classification profile associated with the first directory structure, to resemble the user approach to placing the documents in the second directory structure.

Similar language is included in independent claims 9, 13, 19, and 24. Thus, independent claims 1, 9, 13, 19, and 24, and their corresponding dependent claims, are patentable over Faisal.

Furthermore, each of the additional references cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest at least the above features of the presently claimed invention that are lacking in Faisal.

With respect to claim 29, categories of the class hierarchy in Snow are defined by the user. Specifically, the user in Snow issues various category commands including a command to add a specific category to the class hierarchy, a command to delete a specific category from the class hierarchy, a command to edit a specific category in the class hierarchy, etc. In the presently claimed invention, in contrast, categories or document classes in a document data structure are determined automatically by analyzing the content of documents previously placed in the directories of the document directory structure by the user. Snow does not teach or suggest these features of the presently claimed invention. In particular, Snow lacks at least the features contained in the following language of claim 29:

> ... a processor coupled to the document scanning device and to the document storage device, wherein the processor is to analyze content of documents within the pre-existing document directory structure to determine a plurality of document classes in the pre-existing document directory structure, the plurality of document classes indicating a user approach to placing documents in the second directory structure, to determine a document classification profile of the pre-existing document directory structure based on the plurality of document classes, to analyze content of a document scanned by the document scanning device, to determine which directory in the mirror document directory structure the scanned document is to be placed based on the analysis of the content of the scanned document and the document classification profile of the pre-existing document directory structure, and to store the scanned document in the determined directory in the mirror document directory structure to resemble a user approach to placing documents.

Thus, independent claim 29 and its corresponding dependent claims are patentable over Snow. Furthermore, each of the additional references cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest at least the features of the presently claimed invention that are lacking in Snow.

Accordingly, the presently claimed invention is patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 9, 13, 19, 24 and 29, and their corresponding dependent claims, is not rendered obvious by the above references, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 28, 2004

Marina Portnova
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,750

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300